

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/563,610 | | ESKELINEN, EERO | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| | ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL | | 2167 | |

All Participants:

(1) ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL

(2) Naphtali Mattis, Reg. No. 61,592

Date of Interview: 13 December 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

n/a

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner proposed supplemental examiner's amendment to amend the specification paragraphs [0001] and [0017], which reference the claim numbering which was changed. Attorney agreed to the specification amendments.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: noon

/Alexandria Bromell/
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)